	kba2CorC kjc	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	X	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.
4	V.	20 Cr. 18 (RMB)
5	JONATHAN CORREA,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	Teleconference
8		November 10, 2020 9:30 a.m.
9		
10	Before:	
11	HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN,	
12		District Judge
13		
14	APPEARANCES	
15	AUDREY STRAUSS Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York BY: M. CHRISTINE SLAVIK Assistant United States Attorney	
16		
17		
18	_	
19	DAVID L. WIKSTROM Attorney for Defendant	
20	1	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

THE COURT: Good morning, everybody.

A VOICE: Good morning.

A VOICE: Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.

Just a little background. This is our first appearance together. Mr. Correa was arraigned on September 1 before Magistrate Judge Cott on a one-count indictment charging copyright infringement conspiracy.

Without reading the whole document, I will just indicate that the indictment states that, from at least in or about 2011, up to and including around August 2020 of this year, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, it alleges that Mr. Correa and others, willfully and knowingly, did combine, conspire, and confederate, and agreed together with each other to commit offenses against the United States.

It goes on to describe some of those offenses, or the offenses charged in part, and explains the nature of the conspiracy, which was, in simplest terms, a willful infringement of copyright by the reproduction and distribution, including by electronic means, of ten or more copies of what it calls phonorecords of one or more continued works, which have a total retail value of in excess of \$2,500.

It goes on to describe in more detail the overt acts and the objective of the conspiracy -- could I ask everybody who is not speaking to put their phone on mute while somebody

else is talking?

So at the -- I think it was at the arraignment that Judge Cott also set bail, which is a \$75,000 bond secured by \$75,000 and cosigned by Jacinda Kahle.

Let's talk some process and procedure in this case. I have recently issued an order, so-called Brady order, which is required by virtue of a recent amendment to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5(f), in which the district court is directed and requested to orally, which I am doing at this very moment, and in writing, which I have done by publishing an order, describe and remind the prosecutor of his or her Brady obligations. And in a moment I'm going to ask the prosecutor if in fact they have received the order, read the order, and understand, which I am sure they do, their Brady obligations, and also the consequences which are set forth in the written order, some of the consequences that can ensue if there is violation of Brady.

So let's, since the case is new, let's start out by asking the prosecutor if it has had the opportunity to review the order in particular relating to *Brady* obligations.

MS. SLAVIK: Yes. Good morning, your Honor. This is Christy Slavik for the government, and I can confirm that the government has received the order from the Court dated yesterday, November 9, 2020. The government has read the order and understands the order.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE COURT: Both your obligations and the 2 consequences? 3 MS. SLAVIK: That's right, both the obligations and 4 the consequences, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Great. Thank you so much. 6 So have you all -- when I say "you all," I mean the 7 government and the defense -- had the opportunity to get together and talk about next steps and where we are headed? 8 9 There is one question that I had. There are other indicated 10 coconspirators, and I just wondered what is the status of any 11 or all of those other individuals? Is Mr. Correa the only 12 defendant that we have before the Court? 13 MS. SLAVIK: Yes, your Honor. At this time Mr. Correa 14 is the only defendant before the Court. Another defendant is 15 currently in extradition proceedings, and another defendant is

located in Norway, where there is no extradition treaty, and the government is following up on options with respect to that defendant.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SLAVIK: Now --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MS. SLAVIK: Go ahead.

THE COURT: I was just going --

MS. SLAVIK: I was going to -- I was going to update your Honor on the status of this case involving Mr. Correa.

THE COURT: Yes. Proceed.

MS. SLAVIK: Yes. So since the indictment was unsealed in this case, the parties have engaged in pretty extensive discussions with the goal of reaching a pretrial disposition. We expect to be in a position to update the Court about whether we have reached an agreement on a disposition by the end of November.

Now, in consultation with the defense, the government has deferred production of discovery, of course leaving open the possibility of revisiting that decision in the future. But in terms of next steps, the government proposes setting a control date 60 days out, and of course if the parties are able to reach a disposition before that date, the parties will be in touch to inform the Court of that agreement.

THE COURT: And the pretrial status, so to speak, or supervision of Mr. Correa, that has gone smoothly, to your knowledge?

MS. SLAVIK: Yes, your Honor, very smoothly.

THE COURT: And Mr. Correa lives where? I'm not quite sure.

MS. SLAVIK: Mr. Wikstrom can jump in if I am wrong, but Mr. Correa lives in Kansas City --

MR. WIKSTROM: That's correct, your Honor.

MS. SLAVIK: -- which is the Western District of Kansas.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Got it.

Mr. Wikstrom, did you want to add anything?

MR. WIKSTROM: No. I think just to concur with everything that Ms. Slavik has told the Court already.

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on just one second.

So one other point that I wanted to cover, and that has to do procedurally with the fact that we are proceeding by telephone, obviously, and we are not located, as we might, if this were a year or so ago, be in the courtroom having all of these discussions and subsequent proceedings, and I just wanted to get the defense and the government's view of that, which is to say that the reason this is happening is because of the COVID pandemic, which has made it very difficult to have in-court proceedings. In recent weeks, starting actually in or about October 1, there has been some stepped-up efforts to have some backlogged trials conducted in a courtroom, in one of the larger courtrooms in the building. I think, by all accounts, those trials have gone off successfully. There is a recent heightened vigilance with respect to courtroom proceedings because of what appears to be a second, perhaps, or third spike in the virus. So people's antennae are way up. And, in any event, I'm not sure what the impact is going to be for further courtroom proceedings.

But, in any event, Mr. Wikstrom, I wanted to ask you if you have discussed this aspect of the case with Mr. Correa,

and if you and he are waiving any rights that you might have to appear live, as it were, in a Southern District courtroom?

MR. WIKSTROM: Yes, I have, your Honor. We have discussed extensively his rights to be present in person in court proceedings, and collectively we waive his right for in-person court proceedings and request that the Court conduct proceedings remotely, by telephone or videoconference, in light of the ongoing pandemic.

THE COURT: Great.

Mr. Correa, just to confirm, that is your wish as described by Mr. Wikstrom?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, it is.

THE COURT: Okay. And is the government on board that this is an appropriate and correct way to proceed in light of the current status of the COVID pandemic?

MS. SLAVIK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So before we pick a date, is there anything else that the government or the defense wish to place on the record at this time?

Starting with the government.

MS. SLAVIK: Your Honor, the government would simply move to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act from today until the next scheduled date, but we can do that once the control date has been established.

THE COURT: Great.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And with respect to any resolution, if you would give me a heads up if that is approaching or is about to happen and, depending upon, among other things, the status of the pandemic, I would be able to tell you whether I would take the allocution or direct you all to go before a magistrate judge. But we don't have to resolve that issue at this moment.

MS. SLAVIK: Of course, your Honor.

THE COURT: Christine, have you got your calendar handy and can you suggest a date 60 days or so hence?

THE LAW CLERK: Yes, Judge. How is Tuesday, January 12, at 11:30.

THE COURT: That works for me.

Is that good for the defense, Mr. Wikstrom?

MR. WIKSTROM: It is, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Correa, that works for you, too?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The 12th of January 2021, at 11:30.

And how about the government?

MS. SLAVIK: Yes, your Honor. That's fine for the government.

THE COURT: Okay. And with respect to speedy trial, I appreciate your application, and I am also going to find, under 18 United States Code, Section 3161, that the request for adjournment to and including January 12, 2021, is appropriate and warrants exclusion of the adjourned time from Speedy Trial

calculations.

I further find that the exclusion is designed to prevent any possible miscarriage of justice, to facilitate these proceedings, and to guarantee effective representation of and preparation by counsel for both parties, and thus the need for exclusion and the ends of justice outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B).

Just one more afterthought to present to Mr. Wikstrom. So, at the beginning we had this oral discussion about reference to a written order that I have issued with respect to Brady obligations, and my question at that time was directed primarily to the government, to the prosecutor, but I didn't mean to not hear from you, Mr. Wikstrom. If there is any aspect of that issue, as I say, the Brady issue, that you wish to have me explore in any greater detail or in any other fashion, I'm happy to do that if there is such a comment from you.

MR. WIKSTROM: Thank you, your Honor. It is unnecessary. Mr. Correa and I have discussed the Court's order and the implications thereof and are satisfied with the status of things. Thank you.

THE COURT: Great. All right. Well, I think, then, that concludes our work for today. Unless there is some other development, we will meet again on January 12, 2021, at 11:30,

```
kba2CorC kjc
      in the same fashion as we are meeting today.
1
               Thanks, everybody, for your help.
 2
 3
               MR. WIKSTROM: Thank you, your Honor.
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
 5
               MS. SLAVIK: Thank you.
 6
               THE COURT: You bet. Everybody take care.
 7
                                     000
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```